DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 372 IR 054 920

AUTHOR Weber, Anita M.
TITLE Slow Fires in the Stacks: Theses and Dissertations, A Preservation Survey.
PUB DATE Dec 90
NOTE 60p.; M.L.S. Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; *Archives; *Doctoral Dissertations; Higher Education; *Library Collections; Library Standards; *Preservation; Questionnaires; School Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Kent State University OH; *Library Materials Conservation

ABSTRACT

This paper examines attitudes toward and practices concerning preparation and storage of archival copies of dissertations at the 15 Ohio doctoral granting institutions. The purpose of this study is two-fold: to determine the extent to which archivists and graduate school deans are aware of the preservation standards regarding theses and dissertations as well as the attitudes of archivists concerning responsibility for the care and storage of these documents; and to ascertain the actual physical condition of theses and dissertations. To accomplish this, two surveys were sent to these institutions: one to graduate colleges presumed responsible for drafting standards for production of dissertations to ascertain those standards; the other to archivists to determine the level of care dissertations receive while in their custody, knowledge of national standards, and attitudes concerning responsibility for storage. To determine whether concern over deterioration of dissertations is warranted, a condition survey of Kent State University's dissertations was conducted. Included in the appendices are: a list of archivists and graduate school deans surveyed; the archivists survey; the deans survey; and the book condition survey. (Contains 29 references.) (Author/JLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 367 372

SLOW FIRES IN THE STACKS:

THESES AND DISSERTATIONS, A PRESERVATION SURVEY

A Research Paper Submitted to
Kent State University School of Library Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

BY

ANITA M. WEBER

KENT, OHIO

DECEMBER, 1990

12054920

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Rosemary Du Mont

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

This paper examined attitudes toward and practice concerning preparation and storage of archival copies of dissertations at the fifteen Ohio doctoral granting institutions. To accomplish this, two surveys were sent to these institutions: one to graduate colleges presumed responsible for drafting standards for production of dissertations to ascertain those standards; the other to archivists to determine the level of care dissertations receive while in their custody, knowledge of national standards, and attitudes concerning responsibility for storage. To determine whether concern over deterioration of dissertations is warranted, a condition survey of Kent State University's dissertations was conducted.

Master's Research Paper by

Anita M. Weber

B.A., Northern Illinois University, 1977

M.A., Northern Illinois University, 1979

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1990

Approved by

Advisor Thomas J. Frohlich Date 12/6/90

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. v

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION. 1

CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW. 5

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY. 16

CHAPTER IV. RESULTS. 21

CHAPTER V. CONCLUSIONS. 32

APPENDIX 1. ARCHIVISTS SURVEYED. 41

APPENDIX 2. COVER LETTER TO ARCHIVISTS. 42

APPENDIX 3. ARCHIVISTS SURVEY. 43

APPENDIX 4. GRADUATE SCHOOL DEANS SURVEYED. 46

APPENDIX 5. COVER LETTER TO DEANS. 47

APPENDIX 6. DEANS SURVEY. 48

APPENDIX 7. BOOK CONDITION SURVEY. 50

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 51

LIST OF TABLES

Table I. Comparison of Survey and Standard. 31

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper would have not have been possible with out the generous assistance of a number of professional colleagues, personal friends, and my family. Professional colleagues are thanked throughout the paper at appropriate places. Several friends deserve especial mention: Susan Abram, Rosemerry Rudesal, and Barbara White. All listened to issues not always germane to the research project but vital to its completion: my problems and frustrations throughout this project. Each of my family members, in their own way, contributed to this project, most often by preserving my sanity. Mom, Dad, Cathy, Matthew, Christina, Joan, Craig, Emily, Brian, and Mike were all there when needed to lighten up my days. Lorraine and George kept my spirits up with regular supplies of candy. Clarence Wunderlin, the best husband and editor any woman could ask for, criticized and listened even while burdened with his own books, teaching, and editing projects. Thanks to every one (and to SRB who knows why).

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It has become platitudinous to speak of the slow fires burning in the world's libraries. Reports everywhere are documenting the dire condition of our library collections. Even daily newspapers and Good Morning America have reported the story. But what should librarians do? Handwringing will not solve the problem; only action can. Strides are being made in mass deacidification, a solution especially useful for material already on the shelf. Another route taken by librarians to prevent adding new fuel to the fire is the campaign for acid free (or permanent) book paper.

To date the emphasis has been on the printed book and on newspapers. Yet while progress has been made, academic libraries have a problem of their own creation: theses and dissertations. Each year thousands of these documents are completed by proud candidates and sent to libraries for use by scholars. Yet little is known about how these volumes are produced and stored.

In 1986, Jane Boyd and Don Etherington, under the auspices of the American Library Association, developed Preparation of Archival Copies of Theses and Dissertations. It recommends guidelines for papers, inks, and binding material for use in these scholarly building blocks. Eleven years earlier the Society of American Archivists' College and

University Archives Committee passed a "Resolution on Theses and Dissertations" that recommended certain general standards.[1] However, this study will argue that neither of these standards is widely known to either the graduate schools that set the guidelines and requirements or to the archivists and librarians who administer the completed works.

The purpose of this study is two-fold: 1) to determine the extent to which archivists and graduate school deans are aware of these standards as well as the attitudes of archivists concerning responsibility for care and storage of theses and dissertations and 2) to ascertain the actual physical condition of theses and dissertations. To accomplish this the author conducted a survey of the Ohio doctoral granting-institutions to learn who establishes the standards for preparation, how the dissertations are stored and handled by their libraries, and how widely the ALA and SAA standards are known. The author also conducted a condition survey of the Kent State University Library's dissertation holdings to determine the state of deterioration of these volumes.[2]

---

[1]Jane Boyd and Don Etherington, Preparation of Archival Copies of Theses and Dissertations, (Chicago: American Library Association, 1986); SAA College and University Archives Committee, "Resolution on Theses and Dissertations," in College and University Archives: Selected Readings, (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1979), 175.

[2]This study began as the idea of Ng. George Hing, archivist at Dickinsen College, and Nancy Birk, archivist at Kent State University. The author is grateful to both of them for passing the project on and to Ms Birk for her continued interest in it.

For over one hundred years librarians and paper makers have known that paper and books contain the seeds of their own destruction.[3] Acid and bleach along with groundwood pulp are the inherent vice of books and paper. Add other destructive elements such as high humidity, heat, ultraviolet light, and airborne pollutants, and one has the slow fires mentioned above.

After wrangling over the causes of the problem and likely solutions, academic librarians are finally waging the fight against acid paper with a campaign to encourage book producers to use acid-free papers in all books of enduring value. To date all university presses as well as many of the major

---

[3]A 1981 survey of the literature by Pamela W. Darling discusses preservation practice from 1956 to 1980, but ignores the groundbreaking work done in the last part of the nineteenth and early years of the twentieth centuries. A pair of bibliographies compiled in 1929 and 1940 provide evidence that as early as 1823 the deterioration of paper was noted, and that by 1935 the foundation was laid for today's preservation efforts. Experts found that wood pulp was not permanent, they perceived that microfilming was an appropriate preservation technique for deteriorating books and paper, and they had determined that heat, light, and moisture could destroy books. Pamela W. Darling and Sherelyn Ogden, "From Problems Perceived to Programs in Practice: The Preservation of Library Resources in the U. S. A., 1956-1980," Library Resources and Technical Services 25 (January/March 1981): 9-29; Morris S. Kantrowitz, Ernest W. Spencer, and Robert H. Simmons, eds., Permanence and Durability of Paper: An Annotated Bibliography of the Technical Literature from 1885 A. D. to 1939 A. D. (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1940); and Robert P. Walton, "Causes and Prevention of Deterioration in Book Materials," Bulletin of the New York Public Library 33 (April 1929): 235-51.

publishing houses have agreed to do so.[4] But while these librarians are urging book producers to improve the lifespan of commercially published volumes through the use of acid-free paper, there is no concomitant cry for such paper to be used in theses and dissertations.

---

[4]Under the sponsorship of Senator Claiborne Pell legislation has been passed that would require use of acid-free paper for all permanent federal documents and would encourage all publishers to use acid-free paper as well. A 1988 survey conducted by the American Association of Publishers indicated that fifty-five houses including Houghton Mifflin, Random House, Alfred A. Knopf, and Simon and Schuster have agreed to use permanent paper for first run hardcover books and reference works. Howard Fields, "Senate Passes Pell Bill on Use of Acid-Free Paper," Publishers Weekly, 18 August 1989, 9; "Survey Shows High Use of Acid-Free Paper Now," Publishers Weekly, 26 May 1989, 17; "Top Firms Pledge Use of Acid-Free Paper in Hardcover First Printings," Publishers Weekly, 31 March 1989, 12; and "Permanent Paper Honor Roll," Library Journal, 15 April 1989, 21.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This lack of concern is likely the result of the ambivalence about theses and dissertations. Just what one believes to be the role of theses and dissertations is at the heart of the issue of how to handle them. The hybrid nature of these works contributes to the problem. In some ways theses and dissertations are like books (they consist of bound pages of text). In other ways they are more like manuscripts (unique, original records on loose leaves).[5] Dissertations actually can be both. They begin their lives as manuscripts, but in the process of being bound move into a more book-like appearance. This shift compounds the confusion. Many institutions maintain at least two copies of the dissertation: one in the stacks (a book) the other in the archives (many

---

[5]Finding a single, authoritative definition of manuscript is not easy. The Anglo American Cataloging Rules, Second Edition, 1988 Revision offers "writings (including musical scores, maps, etc.) made by hand, typescripts, and inscriptions on clay, tablets, stone, etc." (619) The SAA "Basic Glossary" provides the much lengthier, if not more helpful "bodies or groups of personal papers with organic unity, artificial collections of documents acquired from various sources . . ., and individual documents acquired by a manuscript repository because of their special importance." (427) Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary offers "a written or typewritten composition or document as distinguished from a printed copy." (725) Neither AACR2 Revised nor the "SAA Glossary" nor other likely sources such as John Carter's ABC for Book Collectors offers a definition of "book." Webster's provides "a set of written, printed, or blank sheets bound together into a volume." (167)

times also in book format, but treated differently.) Librarians catalog those in their custody like books, but to archivists they can be considered a record series of the institution.

This author would argue that there is persuasive evidence to consider dissertations to be unpublished records of an institution, and, as such, deserving of archival care. John Clayton, former archivist at the University of Delaware contends, "each volume [is] the final report, so to speak, of research that was conducted [at a given] institution, by a student under the direction of the faculty [at that] institution on a subject which was of concern to this institution and perhaps to all mankind. This series is proof of [the institution's] standard of scholarship; . . these are the records of [the] institution's intellectual genealogy."[6] This argument accords the dissertation a place equal to that of the records of the president of the university or those of the Board of Trustees. It acknowledges the significant contribution that dissertations make to the history of an institution.

Two Ohio institutions, Cincinnati and Toledo, support this appraisal. In its "Instructions for the Preparation and Depositing of Masters Theses and Doctoral Dissertations," the University of Cincinnati tells candidates: "Your thesis is a

---

[6]"Report of the Subcommittee on Theses and Dissertations," June 19, 1974.

requirement for a degree. At the same time," it continues, "as research, the information it contains is of continuing value. The University's regulations are concerned in particular with the thesis as a permanent record of intellectual accomplishment." The University of Toledo makes a similar statement to its students saying, "your thesis represents a significant contribution to knowledge in your particular discipline."[7]

Not all archivists agree with this assessment of the place of dissertations. William Maher in "Theses and Dissertations," a chapter in the forthcoming College and University Archives, argues that Clayton's view is not necessarily the one to follow. While conceding that Clayton's arguments may have merit, he contends that there are more compelling reasons for librarians to take the lead in handling dissertations. Among Maher's arguments for this position are: the subject content of theses which he feels "suggests the need for library methodology for description, access, and preservation" and the similarity of dissertations to monographs in their handling of diverse subjects as well as the way the works are ultimately used. The issue of ultimate use is a particularly important one to Maher who contends that users of dissertations "have no need or interest in

---

[7]University of Cincinnati, "Instructions for the Preparation and Depositing of Masters Theses and Doctoral Dissertations," n.p.: 1989; University of Toledo, "Handbook for Preparation of Graduate theses and Dissertations," n.p.: n.d.

understanding the context or relationship of one such work to the other generated by the same department or institution--as is commonly the case with much archival research."[8] In other words, the intellectual genealogy argument made by Clayton is not a valid one.

The library literature reflects the ambivalence and confusion over theses and dissertations. Examining three areas of the literature (conservation, general librarianship, and archives) one finds little available on the subject.

None of the standard sources on preservation of library materials discusses the preparation of theses and dissertations. George M. Cunha's Conservation of Library Materials: A Manual and Bibliography on the Care, Repair and Restoration of Library Materials, although an essential source for anyone seeking to understand "the prevailing philosophy of conservation [and learn] presently accepted practices for the examination and treatment of deteriorating library materials" fails to even mention dissertations.[9] Susan G. Swartzburg's Conservation in the Library: A Handbook of Use and Care of Traditional and Nontraditional Materials, a comprehensive

---

[8]William J. Maher, College and University Archives (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, forthcoming), 3-4.

[9]Initially titled Conservation of Library Materials: A Manual and Bibliography on the Care, Repair and Restoration of Library Materials, Cunha's work came out in 1967 as one volume. In 1972 the work was expanded to two volumes and was co-authored by Dorothy Grant Cunha. In 1983 the title changed to Library and Archives Conservation: 1980s and Beyond. All three editions are published by the Scarecrow Press of Metuchen, New Jersey.

collection of essays emphasizes non-book material such as films, sound recordings, and photographs, many of which are making their way into the modern dissertation, but there are no specific references to theses or dissertations here either.[10] Carolyn Clark Morrow and Gay Walker's The Preservation Challenge: A Guide to Conserving Library Materials, is the best general overview of the effects of light, heat, and humidity on paper and books as well as how to care for the material. But there is no discussion of theses and dissertations as a specific item in need of preservation.[11]

There is a paucity of library literature concerned specifically with the problems of theses and dissertations. Much of what is available tends to discuss the technical services aspects of the works such as subject cataloging or acquisitions.[12] For the archivist or librarian responsible

---

[10]Susan Garretson Swartzburg, ed., Conservation in the Library: A Handbook of Use and Care of Traditional and Nontraditional Materials (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1983).

[11]Carolyn Clark Morrow and Gay Walker, The Preservation Challenge: A Guide to Conserving Library Materials (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1989).

[12]Two examples of this type of article are: George D. Harris and Robert Huffman, "Cataloging of Theses: A Survey," Cataloging and Classification Quarterly 5 (Summer 1985): 1-15; and L. S. Ramaiah and T. V. Prafulla Chandra, "Research Dissertations: Problems of Acquisition," Herald of Library Science 24 (July 1985): 202-206. Ramaiah and Chandra note that "nearly 32,000 dissertations are accepted annually all over the world," a statement that gives a sense of the scope of the problem libraries face concerning dissertations.

for theses and dissertations in his custody, this lack of references is cause for dismay.

One article which has a greater scope is that by Kelly Patterson, Carol White, and Martha Whittaker. "Thesis Handling in University Libraries" examines both "the library's role in reviewing dissertations and theses for format" and the technical processing of dissertations. In 1977 the authors decided to find out how involved other institutions were in the preparation of theses and dissertations. To that end they surveyed 100 libraries of doctoral granting institutions concerning binding decisions, format regulations, format checking, cataloging decisions, collation of copies, and availability. This survey did not examine the type of paper or ink used for theses and dissertations, nor did it look at types of bindings and glues.[13]

The authors' found that in 58.6 percent of the schools responding the graduate schools alone made all decisions concerning format and only 17 percent of the schools had participation of any kind by the library in format decisions. Format checking, too, was most often the purview of the graduate schools. The authors did learn, though, that in those libraries where format checks were performed, "checking for paper quality, quality of reproduction, [and] adequacy of

---

[13]Kelly Patterson, Carol White, and Martha Whittaker, "Thesis Handling in University Libraries," Library Resources and Technical Services 21 (Summer 1977): 275.

margins" were the main concerns.[14]

Among the conclusions Patterson, White, and Whittaker drew from their study are that standards should be set and enforced by the graduate schools. Yet at the same time they argue that the "university library must be concerned with the physical format of such papers as it effects legibility, bindability, and archival quality of the copies deposited." They do not, however offer suggestions for accomplishing this dichotomous arrangement.[15]

Although the archival literature is nearly silent on the subject of theses and dissertations, there is available the recommendations made in 1975 by the Society of American Archivists' College and University Archives Committee. This resolution was the end product of John Clayton asking the question: are dissertations institutional records or "are they considered excess baggage that comes in every year producing problems in cataloging, storage, and access?"[16] A sub-committee of the SAA College and University Archives Committee set out, in 1974, to answer this question by drafting a survey that it sent to fifty-eight institutions to determine their practice regarding dissertations. Among the results was the finding that more than fifty percent of the institutions

---

[14]Ibid., 277.

[15]Ibid., 281-82.

[16]"Report of the Sub-committee on Theses and Dissertations," June 19, 1974, 3.

require two copies of the dissertation be submitted; one to circulate and one not. Some forty-seven percent of the respondents required that a ribbon copy be submitted for the non-circulating copy. Nearly seventy-five percent of these institutions submitted their dissertations to UMI for microfilming. Most of the institutions created author, title, and subject access for their dissertations. While questions were not asked regarding paper quality, several respondents volunteered information to the effect that 16 and 20 pound paper was required as was paper of 25 percent rag content.[17]

Following the tabulation of these results, the sub-committee recommended that the College and University Archives Committee "state our position on the handling of theses and dissertations. . . . This record series should be re-evaluated but from the archival point of view."[18] At the behest of Committee chairman William Bigglestone and following several of his recommendations the sub-committee drafted the "Resolution on Theses and Dissertations." Among Bigglestone's suggestions were the ideas that every institution maintain a non-circulating copy, that Permalife paper be used, and that electrostatic copying be encouraged as more permanent than poorly corrected ribbon copies.[19] In September 1975, the

---

[17]Ibid., 3-5.

[18]Ibid., 6.

[19]Letter W. E. Bigglestone to John M. Clayton, Jr., July 1, 1974, [1].

"Resolution" was unanimously passed by the College and University Archives Committee which stated that "the position statement is offered as a source of strength for the archivist to use in working with others in his university."[20] The Committee passed the "Resolution" on to the SAA Council with the suggestion that "the resolution be brought to the attention of the Association of Graduate Schools and the Council of Graduate Schools in the U.S," but there is no evidence that this suggestion was acted upon.[21]

After noting the significance of theses and dissertations to an institution's intellectual record, the "Resolution on Theses and Dissertations" makes several recommendations. Among them are that "the record copy [be] on paper that meets archival standards of permanence and durability" and that any corrections be made by permanent methods. But for all its good intentions and the effort that went into it, this "Resolution" does not offer any guidance on what is archival, nor does it suggest who should monitor the paper standards or how to convince graduate schools of the importance of these recommendations.[22]

For specific information on the papers, inks, and

---

[20]Minutes of meeting, 9/30/75, College and University Archives Committee, 2.

[21]Shonnie Finnegan to Ann Morgan Campbell, 3/26/76 in SAA General Files, Office of the Executive Director, Ann Morgan Campbell, 1974-, Council and Officers, Box 1 200/6/3/2, Council Minutes, 1975-76.

[22]"Resolution," 175.

bindings to use, one must turn to Boyd and Etherington's Preparation of Archival Copies of Theses and Dissertations. This brief (15 pages) manual came about as a result of numerous discussions at ALA Preservation of Library Materials Section meetings and the willingness of Don Etherington to go beyond the discussions and take some action. These discussions, as Etherington recalled them, focused on various local situations of the discussants where the topic of theses would recur. Archival Copies was intended by Etherington and co-worker Jane Boyd to be a first step for students to follow: a way to pull together in one place all the needed information to guide a student in producing a manuscript of enduring value.[23]

Archival Copies is very detailed. For permanent copies Boyd and Etherington require a minimum 20 pound weight paper "selected for its permanence and durability [that is] acid-free with a minimum 2 percent alkaline reserve." Duplicate copies are to be on paper of the same quality. Discussions of type size and ribbon quality are similarly detailed. All corrections, they stipulate, should be "by clean erasure [or] certain self correcting typewriters," any other type is unacceptable. Correcting fluid is especially opposed because of its tendency to bleed and flake. The authors also discuss methods of attaching illustrations and the standards for

---

[23]Background on Preparation of Archival Copies of Theses and Dissertations comes from an October 2, 1990 telephone conversation between Don Etherington and the author.

photographs submitted with theses or dissertations. Of the "other formats" material that can find its way into a dissertation, the authors discuss only music and recorded sound; they recommend reel to reel magnetic tape with a mylar back for archival storage. Neglected are videotapes, computer disks, and other non-paper formats.[24]

[24] Archival Preparation, 1; 3; 10.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The existence of the American Library Association and Society of American Archivists' standards engenders an inquiry into whether they are being implemented at American institutions of higher learning. One way to determine this is to conduct a survey of doctoral granting institutions. Ohio provides a good sample because of the number of institutions available and the range in age of the schools in the state. Thus surveys were mailed to the fifteen doctoral granting institutions in Ohio: Antioch College, Ashland, Bowling Green State, Case Western Reserve, Cleveland State, Kent State, Miami, Ohio State, Wright State and Ohio Universities, the Medical College of Ohio, and the Universities of Akron, Cincinnati, Dayton, and Toledo.[25]

---

[25]The institutions were chosen after examining 1990 Higher Education Directory (Falls Church, VA: Higher Education Publications, Inc., 1990) for Ohio. The Deans of the Graduate Schools were identified from the information in these listings. The archivists for each institution were identified from the 1990 Society of Ohio Archivists and Midwest Archives Conference directories. These surveys began as a group project in LSCI 60691 Preservation Seminar. Jeffrey Rother and Nancy Scarcella were instrumental in devising the initial versions of both surveys and the accompanying cover letters. Richard Rubin at Kent State University generously reviewed the surveys and cover letters for consistency, objectivity, style, and appearance. The survey of archivists includes several questions similar to those in the Patterson, White, and Whittaker survey and several similar to those used by the SAA College and University Archives Committee in their 1973 survey.

The nature of dissertations requires two surveys. The belief is that graduate colleges usually administer the preparation of theses and enforce any standards that are set, while the archive is the place where the finished products are housed in perpetuity. Thus, one survey was sent to the archivists of each institution (Appendix 3) and the other to the graduate colleges (Appendix 6). The purpose of each survey was to determine what standards for paper, if any, are in place at each institution, what are the attitudes of archivists about responsibility for care and storage of theses and dissertations, who is involved in establishing standards, and how theses and dissertations are prepared and stored at the various institutions.

Analysis of the surveys required running frequencies for each question on the two surveys. The small sample size precluded performing any more sophisticated analysis. There are two questions that appear on both surveys. These concern knowledge of the professional standards. Responses to these questions will be compared by institution.

The development of standards by the ALA and SAA presumes there is a need for them. The second component of this project sought to determine if dissertations and theses are in jeopardy because of their paper, ink, glue, and/or environment. Kent State University's collection provided a case study.

The first doctoral programs at Kent State University

"were begun in 1961 and nineteen departments currently offer the Ph.D."[26] As of September 7, 1990 there were 2352 cataloged dissertations housed in the Kent State University Libraries. At least two, and many times three, copies of each are there: one paper copy in the open stacks that circulates, a non-circulating paper copy stored in the archives, and a microfilm copy stored in the PIAS. This study examined a random sample of 100 of the archival copies. To determine this sample 100 random four digit numbers between 0001 and 2352 were chosen from a random number table. All Kent State dissertations can be located on the university's on-line catalog CATALYST by using a title search.[27] Each dissertation is given an entry number (1-2352). The random numbers chosen were matched to the entry numbers provided on CATALYST. If a duplicate number occurred, the next random number was selected. This same procedure was utilized for selected dissertations that proved to be checked out of the library. No effort was made, however, to replace those dissertations not indicated as checked out, but that were missing from the open shelves.

As acidity and embrittlement are both important indicators of the health of a volume, the volumes were tested

---

[26]Graduate Schools Catalog: 1989-1990 Bulletin (Kent, OH: Kent State University, 1989), 23.

[27]This is not a "normal" title search on CATALYST. To obtain this complete listing of KSU dissertations it is necessary to use "t=KSU dissertations."

for ph and brittleness. Each volume was opened to the approximate center of the text; the lower, inner margin was tested for ph and the upper, outer corner used for the brittleness test.[28] Ph was determined using a Light Impressions ph pen # 2396.[29] The MIT fold endurance test was performed to determine the level of embrittlement for each volume. Using an adaptation of the Yale Survey sheet (Appendix 7), further information was gathered about the physical condition of the dissertations including extent of mutilation (if any), leaf attachment, and extent of environmental damage.[30]

As a means of comparison the archival copies were paired

---

[28]The lower, inner margin was chosen for cosmetic reasons. A ph pen marking will be less obtrusive there than on the outer margin.

[29]The Light Impressions ph pen #2396 used in the Yale test contains Bromcresol green "which changes color from blue (acid free) to green (some acid content) to yellow (high acid content) when applied to paper." Light Impressions Fall 1990 Catalog, 45.

[30]There are three major condition surveys which have been published to guide the librarian who chooses to undertake such a project: Gay Walker, et al., "The Yale Survey: A Large Scale Study of Book Deterioration in the Yale University Library," College and University Libraries 46 (March 1985): 111-132; Randall Bond, et al., "Preservation Study at the Syracuse University Libraries," College and University Libraries 48 (March 1987): 132-147; and Sarah Buchanan and Sandra Coleman, "Deterioration Survey of the Stanford University Libraries Green Library Stack Collection," in Preservation Planning Program: Resource Notebook ed. Wesley Boomgaarden and Pamela W. Darling (Washington, D. C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1987): 189-221. The Yale Survey was the most adaptable for this project because the questions are less simplified than those in the other two. It also offers a model for the statistical analyses necessary to compare the data generated in the survey.

with those that circulate. The same condition survey was conducted to determine if the environment and/or wear and tear of use has inflicted any significant damage on the circulating volumes. Not all dissertations are stored in the main library. Chemistry and physics theses, as well as some of those in music are housed in separate facilities. Nearly one dozen of the selected dissertations are located in the chemistry library, a situation that has the benefit of allowing for preliminary comparison between facilities on the Kent State campus.

It was intended to analyze the following intersections after surveying the data: relationship between type of primary protection and if it is intact, the method of leaf attachment and whether the leaves are intact, brittleness and acidity, brittleness and need for repair, brittleness and gutter margin, acidity and leaf attachment, and acidity and gutter margin. It was assumed that the nature of these relationships would be important indicators of the relative health of Kent State University's dissertations. However, the survey did not yield the data necessary to accomplish this objective.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The results of the two components of this project will indicate whether the archive and library professions have been successful in implementing their standards for thesis and dissertation preparation. They will also show whether dissertations housed in Ohio libraries are in danger of self immolation.

A. Institutional Surveys

1. Archivist's Survey[31]

All fifteen archivists responded to the survey. At the outset archivists were asked for some general information about their repositories and dissertations. Archives in this survey were established as early as 1952 and as late as 1983. Twelve of the repositories are responsible for storing a copy of completed dissertations. The volume of dissertations received annually varied greatly--from 15 to 860--as did the total number of theses and dissertations held--from 153 to 20,800.

---

[31]Analysis of the data in these surveys would not have been possible without the gracious assistance of Martha Kyrillidou who explained everything from data entry to how to run SPSS on the mainframe. Most of the results discussed in this section, are based on a population of 12. Those archivists not responsible for storage did not answer the questions on the first two pages of the survey. This small sample size must be kept in mind when reading the percentages.

The survey then turned to specific information about newly completed dissertations. Candidates at 54.5 percent of the institutions are required to submit two copies of the dissertation; 27.5 percent require three copies be submitted, while 9.1 percent require only one copy. Nearly all institutions (83.3 percent) require that one of these copies be the original.

Preservation by microform is an important option employed by Ohio's universities. Three-quarters of the institutions send their dissertations to University Microfilms for inclusion in Dissertation Abstracts (but only 16.7 percent send Masters theses to Masters Abstracts). Once these dissertations are returned, they are most often (55.5%) sent to the archives for storage. Ultimately 83.3 percent of institutions send one copy of all completed dissertations to the archives. And 84.4 percent provide a circulating copy.

When asked what types of copies are accepted for those additional required copies of the dissertation, 83.3 percent indicated that photoduplication was acceptable, 50 percent indicated computer generated copies were acceptable, and 33.3 percent indicated that other types of copies including first carbons, multilith, blueprints, and microfilm were acceptable. Several archivists noted that for their purposes an "original" was any dissertation with an original signed signature page regardless of the generation of the actual dissertation. Nearly three-quarters indicated that their circulating copy

was a photocopy of the original.

How dissertations are stored was the next question of the survey. Bound was the most common response: 92.3 percent of the institutions store their dissertations in this fashion. One institution stores its dissertations bound and foldered, while two (15.4%) indicated they box and folder at least some of their dissertations. And two institutions indicated that microfilm was their storage medium for archival copies.

Most repositories place some type of restrictions on access to archival copies of dissertations. Usually these are the requirement that dissertations be used only in the reading room. One allows archival copies to circulate to their interlibrary loan department for photoduplication. Another set limits on the amount of photocopying allowed from dissertations: those older that 1954 can be copied in their entirety, while for post-1954 dissertations only one-half of the total number of pages will be copied.

Time restrictions on access are another issue of interest. Less than one-third (30.8%) of the archivists indicated that this is acceptable practice. Among the instances when time restrictions were allowed were: "student with grad college approval asked us not to catalog and circulate his dissertation until book published" and "stipulations of a research grant." In one instance a student asked for, and received, a ten year restriction. However, from the responses given, restrictions of this nature do not

seem to be commonplace.

The growing interest in the proliferation of "non-book" material in other areas of archives and the library led to a question concerning the storage of such material as floppy disks, video tapes, and sound recordings in dissertations and how such material is made available to researchers. Eight of the repositories (53.7 percent) indicated that the "other formats" issue had not yet arisen at their institution. In the other institutions, creative solutions are being implemented as the situation arises. Two noted that, where possible, pockets are created for maps, scores, and other items. One institution indicated that it special binds the material and stores it next to the other volumes. In all instances, except one, an effort seems to be made to keep the material with the paper versions of dissertations. The exception involves sending audio recordings to the music library with this transfer noted for patrons.

Access to these "other format" items does not appear to pose a problem. Microfilm readers are accessible in institutions that need them. One institution sends students to the library's audiovisual department with the tapes or videos after securing the student's identification card as collateral. For all other institutions the "non-book" material is neither a challenge nor an issue.

One last question about dissertations focused on access points (ie. cataloging). Six types of access points were

offered to the archivists: author, title, subject, faculty advisor, department, and date of degree. Author access is provided in 86.7 percent of the institutions, title access in 80 percent, and subject access in 60 percent. These three areas proved to be the most common access points; the other three were far behind in their use: date of degree in 46.7 percent of the institutions, department in 33.3 percent, and faculty advisor in only 6.7 percent of the institutions. Eight libraries provide their dissertations with either OCLC or their own full cataloging, one institution plans to begin doing so, and one has determined that it will stop such full cataloging.

A separate section of this survey concerned archivists' attitudes about the preparation and storage of dissertations and their knowledge of the ALA and SAA standards. When asked about their awareness of the ALA guideline developed by Boyd and Etherington, 46.7 percent indicated that they knew of it while 53.3 percent did not. Knowledge of the SAA resolution was slightly higher with 60 percent showing awareness of it and 40 percent not. But, 46.7 percent knew of neither standard and 46.7 knew of both. Only one archivist was aware of the SAA resolution and not the ALA standard. When asked if archival standards should be implemented, 86.7 percent (13) said yes. The other two archivists indicated there really was no need for archival standards because microfilm could pick up the slack if the paper copies disintegrated.

An important segment of the survey addressed the issue of who should store and catalog dissertations. On the storage question 15.4 percent of the archivists indicated the library should store them, 53.8 percent indicated the archives should, and 30.8 percent noted that either place was appropriate. When asked about cataloging, though, 86.7 percent named the library as the organization best responsible for the task while only 13.3 percent felt the archives should perform it.

Finally, the respondents were asked whether they, or anyone on their staff, were involved in helping to establish their institution's standards for dissertation preparation. The survey indicated that although 86.7 percent of the archivists surveyed are responsible for storing dissertations, only 21.4 percent are involved in helping to set up the standards for these dissertations' creation.

2. Graduate School Survey

The response rate from the graduate schools was not as high as that of the archivists. Eleven of fifteen graduate schools responded to the survey and ten surveys were returned: a response rate of 66.7 percent. The institutions surveyed ranged in age from twelve to 161 years old with a mean age of 70. The number of dissertations submitted in the past year ranged from 28 to 597 with a mean of 310.

When asked about their standards, all institutions indicated that they had standards for the preparation of

dissertations. Eight of them provided a copy of their current standards along with the survey to supplement their responses. All indicated that their standards have recently been revised; 50 percent of them in 1990, all of them since 1987. The frequency of revision seems to be on an as needed basis.

The composition of paper is vital to its preservation. With that in mind one question asked what percent rag content was specified and whether acid free paper is required. The most commonly required rag content for originals is 25 percent--40 percent of the institutions require this. Papers of 20 percent and 50 percent rag are each required by 20 percent of the institutions while 10 percent require 80 percent rag and another 10 percent require an all rag paper. For copies, the numbers are similar although no one requires 80 percent rag paper: 37.5 percent require 25 percent rag, 25 percent require 20 percent rag or 50 percent rag, and 12.5 percent require the all rag paper.

On the use of acid free paper for originals, 60 percent indicated that this is required, while 40 percent did not. For copies the split is nearly the same--55.6 require acid free paper and 45.4 do not.

The final section of the survey attempted to determine awareness of the ALA and SAA standards. Knowledge of the ALA guidelines among the deans surveyed was split 50/50. But 80 percent indicated they had no knowledge of the SAA resolution. Half of the respondents knew of neither guideline, and 20

percent knew of both. The deans were also asked if their institution followed either of these guidelines. Not surprisingly, 66.7 percent indicated that they do not. But 90 percent expressed an interest in learning more about the standards.

The deans were asked to indicate, by title, who is responsible for establishing/revising dissertation standards. Among the responses given are: committees drawn from the faculty senate, the curriculum committee, individual colleges, various assistant and associate deans of the graduate colleges, and the deans of the graduate colleges themselves. In only two instances is a librarian named as being a member of this decision-making group: once in conjunction with the associate vice-president and once with the library staff. Archivists were never mentioned.

B. Dissertation Condition Surveys

1. Archives Survey

The dissertations surveyed ranged in date of publication from 1967 to 1989 with the mean date being 1978. Nearly all (98%) of the archival copies are stored bound on the shelves; the remaining two percent are in acid free folders in acid free boxes. The volumes appear remarkably healthy: all the bindings are intact, only one dissertation exhibited evidence of loose leaves, none of the pages are torn into the text, all

attachments are still attached, and only one volume shows evidence of environmental damage.

This evident good health manifested itself in another way as well. None of the dissertations surveyed shows signs of embrittlement. Acidity, however, is another story. In this area the dissertations did not fare as well. Blue indicators (no acid) were seen on 32 percent of the works. Green indicators (some acid) were seen on 53 percent of the works. And yellow indicators (high acid) were seen on 15 percent of the works. On the face of it, the levels of acidity among the groups does not appear too bad: most of the volumes showed only some acid, but combining the green and yellow categories, one finds 68 percent of the works to be no longer alkaline. This high degree of acidity is not a good sign.

One particularly discouraging result was the lack of correlation between date and acidity. Those showing no acid ranged in date from 1969 to 1989. Indication of some acidity was seen on volumes from 1967 to 1987. High acidity appeared on works from 1969 to 1983. This means that all works are in jeopardy regardless of their age.

2. Stacks Survey[32]

In the stacks the situation was much the same as found in

[32]This analysis is based on a sample size of 78. Eleven of the original 100 dissertations are in the chemistry library and will be discussed in the next section. The remaining eleven works were missing from the shelves, but not checked out, at the time of the survey.

the archives. All volumes are bound and their bindings are intact; 2.6 percent have loose pages, but none of those pages is torn through the text; a mere 5 percent have any kind of marking on the pages (underlining, comments, etc.); attachments are still intact in those that have them; there is no evidence of environmental damage; and only 2.6 percent of the volumes appear in need of immediate treatment.

Again, as in the archives, none of the dissertations showed signs of embrittlement. Corners felt as if they could be folded forever! But, again, acidity is another matter. In the stacks only 26.9 percent of the works showed no sign of acidity, while 19.2 percent showed a high level of acidity. In the remaining 53.8 percent of the volumes some acidity was noted. Once again there is no correlation between date and acidity. No acidity indicators were found in volumes from 1969 to 1987, some acidity from 1969 to 1989, and yellow ones from 1969 to 1985.

3. Chemistry Library Survey

The chemistry library sample is a very small one; only eleven items, but this comprised eleven percent of the total sample. These eleven dissertations were found in excellent shape. None are damaged, or written in, or torn. None are brittle either. But they did manifest a higher acidity level than did their fellow dissertations. Only 18.2 percent of them indicated no acidity, while 54.5 percent showed some

acidity, and 27.5 percent indicated high acid levels. The pattern of no correlation between date and acid level continued in the chemistry library sample. Those showing high acidity ranged from 1967 to 1979, those with some acidity from 1974 to 1982, and those with no acidity from 1972 to 1983.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this project provide a number of issues for consideration. the most important of these are: comparison of graduate school standards with those of Boyd and Etherington; examination of how successful the professions have been in getting their standards implemented; and analysis of the implications of the health of KSU's dissertations for both Kent State and other institutions.

With Preparation of Archival Copies of Theses and Dissertations, we have a brief manual of practice. As stated above, it suggests an acid-free paper of 20 lb weight, with a minimum 2% alkaline reserve, for all original dissertations. For copies it recommends the same type of paper, but suggests no more than 25% rag content lest the print easily rub off or erase. An examination of the standards sent by the graduate schools indicates that they have a way to go before reaching those in Archival Copies.

Table I lists the weight and rag content of papers required by eight of the surveyed schools. It also indicates whether acid-free paper is mentioned in their standard and how the institutions responded to the acid-free paper question on the survey.

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF SURVEY AND STANDARD

School	Weight of paper	Rag content	Standard	Survey
A	16 lb	25%	no mention	yes
B	20 lb	25%	no mention	no
C	20 lb	50%	no mention	no
D	-----	25%	no mention	yes
E	20 lb	50%	no mention[1]	yes
F	20 lb	25%	acid-free 1% reserve	yes
G	20 lb	80%	no mention	no
H	20-25 lb	20-25%	not required[2]	yes

[1]Recommends "Crane's Thesis Paper--100%, Eaton Berkshire--50%, Eaton Berkshire Parchment Bond--100%, Southworth Parchment Record--75%, and Swan Linen Bond--100%," but does not specifically state that paper should be acid-free.

[2]The term "acid-free" is not used by this institution, but Howard "Permalife" paper is recommended as appropriate and is readily available from this University's Bookstore.

Most of the schools require paper of the weight Boyd and Etherington recommend. Only one requires a less hefty paper (16lb) than is suggested. While a specific rag content paper is required at all schools, Archival Copies does not specify one. This is probably a result of earlier notions that the higher the cotton on linen content of a paper the more permanent it was. But with the advent of acid-free paper, it is no longer necessary to use rag content as an indicator of

permanence.

Two of the schools require a higher rag content for their copies than Boyd and Etherington found to be appropriate, and one allows a lower rag content. Whether losing text is a problem at these institutions is not known. The quality of paper used for copies is especially important at those institutions that do not make a distinction between copies and originals. In these cases, it must be ensured that the archival copy is on appropriate paper.

An interesting phenomenon can be seen in the next two columns of the chart. Only one school specifically mentions in its standard that it requires acid-free paper (albeit a paper with only 1% alkaline reserve). Another school recommends, by name, Howard's "Permalife" paper, but does not mention its acid-free properties. In contrast, on their surveys four of the other institutions indicated that they do require candidates to use an acid-free paper. Do those officials responsible for defining the institutions standards not know what acid-free paper is? Have they updated their standards? Further investigation is needed to resolve this discrepancy.

Knowledge of the American Library Association and Society of American Archivists' standards seems to be an all or nothing proposition. The survey results indicate an appalling lack of awareness of these two documents. With 46.7 percent of archivists and 50 percent of the graduate school deans

unaware of either of these two standards, the conclusion is obvious.[33] Both the American Library Association and the Society of American Archivists have failed terribly in their efforts to publicize their standards for dissertation preparation. Both professions must do more than just promulgate standards that are publicized among themselves. Establishing a standard no one has heard of, or one not complied with at the institutions, accomplishes nothing more than to make the committee which devised it feel good. More must be done. These two service professions should not rely on their membership passing the standards on to the appropriate parties at their institutions. Professionals must become active advocates for the implementation of these standards at the state or regional level through their professional organizations such as the Ohio Library Association, the Society of Ohio Archivists, and the Midwest Archives Conference.

Two aspects of the dissertation preparation process provide archivists and librarians with mechanisms to achieve

---

[33]When the awareness responses of the eleven institutions where both archivist and graduate school dean replied to the survey are compared, the distribution of this awareness becomes quite thin. There were no institutions where both archivists and deans were familiar with both of the standards. Only 9.1 percent of the institutions had an archivist and a dean aware of at least one of the standards. In 27.3 percent of the institutions neither office knew of the standards. At 36.4 percent of the institutions the archivist knew of at least one of the standards while the dean knew of one. And at 27.3 percent of the institutions the dean knew of at least one of the standards but the archivist knew of neither.

compliance. One is the similarity among the graduate school standards; the other is the way dissertation costs are appropriated.

Examination of the eight guidelines provided by participants in this survey indicates the remarkable degree of similarity that exists among these "Handbooks" on thesis and dissertation preparation. Among the common components are technical requirements for paper, numbers of copies, margins, page size; accepted style manuals; sample pages; and submission procedures and deadlines. This indicates a certain level of consensus on the subject[34]. And this similarity can be exploited by preservation specialists. If the deans could collectively be informed of Archival Copies and the importance of implementing it, its acceptance should be easy to obtain.

Playing to the cost-conscious nature of administrators could also make incorporation of Archival Copies congenial to them. Requiring acid free paper and the other recommendations of Archival Copies would cost the schools no money. All the costs of dissertation preparation are borne by the candidate. Requiring acid free paper would be no different than the requirement of bond paper of a certain weight. Given that acid free paper is no more costly than ordinary bond paper, the students would not suffer either. Two of the institutions

---

[34]Where this consensus comes from is not a matter for speculation here, but it should be examined. Knowledge of this consensus making arena would provide another avenue that archivists and librarians could use to encourage acceptance of the standards.

already have archival papers available in their bookstores. Others could easily follow suit.

If acidity and brittleness are the tests of a book's health, then the results are decidedly mixed for KSU's dissertations. The lack of brittleness in the dissertations came as a surprise and is an encouraging sign. It is especially welcome in light of the 68 percent of the dissertations that showed some sign of acidity. The lack of correlation between age and acidity, however, is a bad sign. This means that there is no way to predict which volumes might be likely to disintegrate.

Among the three libraries tested, between 53 and 54.5 percent of the volumes indicated some level of acidity. It was only at the high and low ends of the scale that there were marked differences. At this point there is not enough data available to determine what factors might be causing these differences in the KSU libraries.

The most startling conclusion about Kent State's dissertations is their good health. If there are slow fires in the stacks, they are very slow indeed. This fact could buy time for them, but this time should not be squandered.

Some will argue that there is no need for concern at all. Because of University Microfilm International's Dissertation Services,[35] it has been suggested that paper standards for

---

[35]Currently three-quarters of Ohio's doctoral institutions are participants in University Microfilm International's Dissertation Services: Bowling Green, Case Western Reserve,

thesis and dissertation preparation are moot. If a paper copy is destroyed, runs the argument, one need only turn to UMI for a replacement. At least one archivist surveyed agrees with this theory: "we are presently trying to stop the storage of an archival copy of dissertations in [the] University Archives since they are available from UMI should circulating copy disappear."

However, there are two problems with this argument. First, archivists are finding that microfilm might not be as permanent as suspected; even that film developed and stored following the nationally accepted standards.[36] Second, a large area of scholarship remains unprotected. Not all doctoral granting institutions participate in UMI filming; the vast majority of all Master's theses remain unfilmed as well. Of the 1205 institutions in the United States that grant Master's degrees and the 453 that confer doctorates, only 347

Cleveland State, Kent State, the Medical College of Ohio, Miami, Ohio State, Ohio University, Akron, Cincinnati, Toledo, and Dayton. this list of participating institutions comes from Dissertation Abstracts International, January 1990, xii-xv. Participation does not mean that all dissertations at an institution are microfilmed. "Some participating institutions publish all their dissertations, while others choose to publish only current dissertations." DAI, xii.

[36]Ellen McCrady, The History of Microfilm Blemishes," Restaurator 6 (1984): 191-204; "Blemishes on Security Microfilm," For the Record. . . Newsletter of the Illinois State Archives 11 (Spring 1990):2-4. Thanks go to Frank Boles of the Bentley Historical Library for raising this issue and Timothy L. Ericson at the Milwaukee Urban Archives for providing the article about the Illinois State Archives blemishes outbreak.

of them are UMI participating institutions.[37] The existence of UMI is not a panacea for the problem of paper disintegration in theses and dissertations.

Regardless of possible alternatives such as microfilm, the deterioration of paper copies of dissertations remains an issue. Librarians and archivists need to know the extent of the problems confronting them. This survey of Kent State University's dissertations provides a start. But, it is just one of many institutions facing this issue. To get a better understanding of the breadth of the problem, other, older dissertation collections must be examined to obtain a true picture of the health of dissertations in the state of Ohio.

Given the Kent State University sample, the slow fires in the dissertation stacks may be slower than we thought. But this does not mean that those responsible for maintaining dissertations can sit by complacent in this knowledge. A more active stance must be taken. Graduate schools, or even better, the Association of Graduate Schools and Council of Graduate Schools, must be encouraged to implement standards such as Archival Copies. The lack of interest in dissertations by both librarians and archivists must come to an end. No longer can either group sit by and say that the other should take care of the problem of storage and access.

---

[37]National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics, 1989. (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1989), 237; Dissertation Abstracts International A, 50 (May 1990), xii-xv.

Greater cooperation and awareness of the importance of these scholarly building blocks must occur or the intellectual history of our institutions of higher learning will neither be accessible nor available to generations to come.

APPENDIX 1

SURVEYS WERE SENT TO THE FOLLOWING ARCHIVISTS:

Antioch College
Antiochiana
Yellow Springs, Ohio
45387
513-767-7331 x200

George Bain
Ohio University Archives
Athens, Ohio 45701
614-593-2710

William G. Becker
Cleveland State University
Archives--RT 502
Cleveland, Ohio 44
216-687-3529

Darwyn Batway
Ashland College Library
Ashland, Ohio 44805
419-229-5423

Nancy Birk
Archives
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242
216-672-2411

Alice Cornell, Head
Archives and Rare Books
Mail Location 113
Carl Blegan Library
University of Cinncinati
Cinncinati, Ohio 45211
513-475-6459

Barbara Floyd
Ward Canaday Center
University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606
419-537-2170

Raimund E. Goerler
University Archives
Ohio State University
2121 Tuttle Park Place
Columbus, Ohio 43210
614-292-2409

Dennis Harrison
Case Western Univ.
University Archives
317 Quail Building
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
216-368-3370

Br. Bernard Laurenaitis
Campus PO Box 445
University of Dayton
Dayton, Ohio 45469

Frances McClure
Miami University
King Library
Oxford, Ohio 45056
513-529-2537

John V. Miller
Archival Services
Bierce Library
University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44325
216-375-7670

Patricia Nolan
Head of Archives
Wright State University
University Library-Arch.
Dayton, Ohio 45435

Paul Yon, Director
Center for Archival Coll.
5th Flr. Jerome Library
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402
419-375-2411

Medical College of Ohio

APPENDIX 2

880 Bryce
Kent, Ohio
44240

September 10, 1990

Mr. Darwyn Batway
Ashland University Library
Ashland, Ohio 44805

Dear Mr. Batway:

As part of my Library Science research project at Kent State University, I am investigating the treatment and dissemination of theses and dissertations. This includes how they are prepared, stored, and used. I am requesting your assistance by responding to the enclosed questionnaire. A second, related questionnaire is being sent to the graduate college of your institution.

Dissertations and theses represent vital resources for research among academics, researchers, and students, yet little is known about how they are handled. The current study seeks to remedy this condition by examining practices at Ohio doctorate granting institutions.

I would appreciate your cooperation. Enclosed is a stamped, self-addressed envelope in which the completed questionnaire is to be returned. Your responses, of course, will be kept confidential. I would appreciate your reply by September 15, 1990.

Thank you for your assistance. I look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

Anita M. Weber

APPENDIX 3

SURVEY

When was your archives established? _____

Does your institution retain an archival copy of theses and dissertations?

_____yes _____no

Is the Archives responsible for storage of this archival copy?

_____yes _____no

If yes, please continue survey.

If no, please go to page 3.

How many theses and dissertations were delivered to the archives last year? _____

What is the total number of theses and dissertations in your custody? _____

How many copies must each candidate for an advanced degree submit to your institution?

_____Master's Thesis _____Doctoral Dissertation

Must one of these be the original copy?

_____yes _____no

What is the final disposition of each of these copies? (Please use OD for the Original Doctoral Dissertation, OT for the Original Master's Theses, CD for a Copy of Dissertation, CT for Copy of the Thesis.)

_____copy sent to University Microfilms for inclusion in Dissertation Asbstracts; when it is returned it is retained by _____ (name of office).

_____copy sent to University Microfilms for inclusion in Master's Abstracts; when it is returned it is retained by _____ (name of office).

_____copy placed in circulating collection of Library.

_____copy placed in non-circulating collection of Library.

_____copy placed in Archives.

_____other (please specify)_____

_____

_____

Which modes of reproduction will your institution accept for copies?

_____photoduplication

_____computer generated

_____other (please explain)

How are theses and dissertations stored in your repository?

_____bound
_____unbound and foldered
_____boxed
_____other (please explain)_____
_____
_____

Does your institution provide a circulating copy of theses and dissertations?

_____yes _____no

If yes, are these:

_____photocopies of the original
_____UMI paper copies
_____UMI microfilm copies
_____other (please explain) _____
_____
_____

Are there any restrictions on the uses of archival copies of theses and dissertations?

_____
_____
_____

Are academic departments or students themselves allowed to place time restrictions (eg. closed for x years) on theses and dissertations?

_____yes _____no

If yes, please provide an example.

_____
_____
_____

How do you store theses and dissertations which, either in whole or in part, are in "other formats" eg. video, floppy disks?

_____
_____
_____

How do you provide access to theses and dissertations which, either in whole or in part, are in "other formats" eg. video, floppy disks?

_____
_____
_____

To what extent are finding aids/access points produced for theses and dissertations?

_____name of author
_____title of work
_____subject(s) of work
_____name of principal faculty advisor
_____department in which written
_____year in which degree was received
_____other(please explain)_____
_____

Are you aware of the American Library Association's guidelines for theses and dissertations?

_____yes _____no

Are you aware of the Society of American Archivists' Resolution on Theses and Dissertations?

_____yes _____no

Do you think archival standards should be implemented for theses and dissertations?

_____yes _____no

Who do you think <u>should</u> be responsible for the storage of theses and dissertations?

_____library
_____archives
_____department

Who do you think <u>should</u> be responsible for cataloging and technical processing of theses and dissertations?

_____library
_____archives
_____department

Are you, or a member of your staff, involved in establishing style guides for the graduate departments at your institution?

_____yes _____no

Please provide any additional comments you might have.

_____
_____
_____
_____

Title of person completing survey:_____

PLEASE RETURN SURVEY BY SEPTEMBER 15, 1990 TO:

ANITA M. WEBER
880 BRYCE
KENT, OHIO 44240

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

APPENDIX 4

SURVEYS WERE SENT TO THE FOLLOWING SCHOOLS:

Antioch University
Yellow Springs, Ohio

Bowling Green State University
Dr. Louis I. Katzner
Dean, Graduate College

Ashland University
Dr. Stanford Siders
Assoc Dean/Dir Grad Stds

Case Western Reserve University
Dr. Thomas H. Moss
Dean of Grad Studies and Research

Cleveland State University
Dr. A. Harry Andrist
Dean, College Grad Studies

Kent State University
Dr. Robert E. Powell
Dean Graduate College

Medical College of Ohio
Dr. Peter J. Goldblatt
Dean of Graduate School

Miami University
Dr. Leonard J. Simutis
Dean, Graduate School and Research

Ohio State University
Dr. Roy A. Koenigsknecht
Dean of Graduate School

Ohio University
Dr. T. Lloyd Chestnut
Assoc. Provost Grad/Res Proj

Douglas E. McCabe
Grad Student Office

University of Akron
Dr. Patricia Carrell
Actg Dean, Grad Stdies/Research

University of Cincinnati
Dr. Eula L. Bingham
VP Univ/Dean Grad Std Research

University of Dayton
Dr. George B. Noland
Assoc Provost/Dir Resch

University of Toledo
Dr. Harold L. Allen
VPGrad Stds/Resrch/Econ Dev

Wright State University
Dr. Donald C. Thomas
Dean of Graduate Studies

Names compiled from: 1990 Higher Education Directory, Falls Church VA: Higher Education Publications, 1990.

APPENDIX 5

880 Bryce
Kent, Ohio
44240

August 21, 1990

Dear:

As part of my Library Science research project at Kent State University, I am investigating the treatment and dissemination of theses and dissertations. This includes how they are prepared and stored, and used. I am requesting your assistance by responding to the enclosed questionnaire. A second, related questionnaire is being sent to the archivist at your institution.

Dissertations and theses represent vital resources for research among academics, researchers, and students, yet little is known about how they are handled. The current study seeks to remedy this condition by examining practices at Ohio doctorate granting institutions.

I would appreciate your cooperation. Enclosed is a stamped, self-addressed envelope in which to return the completed questionnaire. Your responses, of course will be kept confidential. I would appreciate your reply by September 15, 1990.

Thank you for your assistance. I look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

Anita M. Weber

APPENDIX 6

SURVEY

In what year was the first thesis or dissertation completed at your institution?_____

How many theses and dissertations were submitted to your office last year?_____

Do you have specific standards for the paper, printing, and binding of theses and dissertations?

_____yes _____no

Title of person (or persons) who devise these standards_____

_____

_____

Have your standards been revised?

_____yes _____no

If so, how frequently are they revised?_____

If so, date of last revision?_____

Who is responsible for binding dissertations?

_____in-house bindery
_____contract bindery
_____not bound
_____do not know

How many copies are candidates required to submit?_____

Regarding your standards for originals:

What % rag content do you require?_____%
Do you require acid free paper?_____yes _____no

Regarding your standards for copies:

What % rag content do you require?_____%
Do you require acid free paper?_____yes _____no

Are you aware of the American Library Association's guidelines for theses and dissertations?

_____yes _____no

Are you aware of the Society of American Archivists' Resolution on Theses and Dissertations?

_____yes _____no

If yes, does your institution follow either of these guidelines?

_____yes _____no _____do not know

If no, would you be interested in learning more about these guidelines?

_____yes _____no _____do not know

If possible, please send me a copy of your institution's style guide for theses and dissertations.

Please provide any additional comments you might have.

_____
_____
_____
_____

Title of person completing survey:_____

PLEASE RETURN SURVEY BY SEPTEMBER 15, 1990 TO:

ANITA M. WEBER
880 BRYCE
KENT, OHIO 44240

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

APPENDIX 7

BOOK CONDITION SURVEY

CALL NUMBER_____ LOCATION_____

DATE OF PUBLICATION_____

* * * * * *

Type of primary protection _____box _____binding

Primary protection intact? _____yes _____no

Method of leaf attachment _____sewn _____glued _____stapled

Leaves intact? _____yes _____no

Paper brittle? _____no break _____2 folds _____4 folds

Paper acidic? _____(determine these levels)

Printed area of page intact? _____yes _____no

Mutilated? _____yes _____no

How? _____underlining _____food _____tape _____torn

Attachments intact? _____yes _____no _____no attachments

Environmental damage? _____yes _____no

What? _____fading _____water _____gnawing _____insects

Immediate treatment required? _____yes _____no

What? _____

Gutter width? _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Blemishes on Security Microfilm." For the Record. . . Newsletter of the Illinois State Archives 11 (Spring 1990): 2-3.

Bond, Randall, Mary DeCarlo, Elizabeth Henes, and Eileen Snyder. "Preservation Study at the Syracuse University Libraries." College and University Libraries 48 (March 1987): 132-147.

Boyd, Jane and Don Etherington. Preparation of Archival Copies of Theses and Dissertations. Chicago: American Library Association, 1986.

Buchanan, Sarah and Sandra Coleman. "Deterioration Survey of the Stanford University Libraries Green Library Stack Collection." In Preservation Planning Program: Resource Notebook, ed. Wesley Boomgaarden and Pamela W. Darling, 189-221. Washington, D. C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1987.

Crawford, Miriam I. "Interpreting University Archives to the Librarian." Pennsylvania Library Association Bulletin 23 (November 1968): 349-58. In College and University Archives: Selected Readings, 58-67. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1979.

Cunha, George M. Conservation of Library Materials: A Manual and Bibliography on the Care, Repair and Restoration of Library Materials. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1967.

_____ and Dorothy Grant Cunha. Conservation of Library Materials: A Manual and Bibliography on the Care, Repair and Restoration of Library Materials. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1972.

_____. Library and Archives Conservation: 1980s and Beyond. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1983.

Darling, Pamela W. and Sherelyn Ogden. "From Problems Perceived to Programs in Practice: The Preservation of Library Resources in the U. S. A., 1956-1980." Library Resources and Technical Services 25 (January/March 1981): 9-29.

Dissertation Abstracts International A 50 (May 1990).

Fields, Howard. "Senate Passes Pell Bill on Use of Acid-Free Paper." Publishers Weekly, 18 August 1989, 9.

Harris, George D. and Robert Huffman. "Cataloging of Theses: A Survey." Cataloging and Classification Quarterly 5 (Summer 1985): 1-15.

Kantrowitz, Morris S., Ernest W. Spencer, and Robert H. Simmons, eds. Permanence and Durability of Paper: An Annotated Bibliography of the Literature from 1885 A. D. to 1939 A. D. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1940.

Maher, William J. "College and University Archives." Chicago: Society of American Archivists, forthcoming.

McCrady, Ellen. "The History of Microfilm Blemishes." Restaurator 6 (1984): 191-204.

Morrow, Carolyn Clark and Gay Walker. The Preservation Challenge: A Guide to Conserving Library Materials. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1989.

1990 Higher Education Directory. Falls Church, VA: Higher Education Publications, Inc., 1990.

National Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics, 1989. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1989.

Patterson, Kelly, Carol White, and Martha Whittaker. "Thesis Handling in University Libraries." Library Resources and Technical Services 21 (Summer 1977): 274-285.

"Permanent Paper Honor Role." Library Journal, 15 April 1989, 21.

Ramaiah, L. S. and T. V. Prafulla Chandra. "Research Dissertations: Problems of Acquisition." Herald of Library Science 24 (July 1985): 202-206.

Shipton, Clifford K. "The Reference Use of Archives." In University Archives ed. Rolland Stevens. Allerton Park Institute No. 11. Urbana: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, 1965. In College and University Archives: Selected Readings, 125-135. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1979.

Society of American Archivists College and University Archives Committee. "Resolution on Theses and Dissertations." In College and University Archives: Selected Readings, 175. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1979.

Swartzburg, Susan Garretson, ed. Conservation in the Library: A Handbook of Use and Care of Traditional and Nontraditional Materials. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1983.

"Survey Shows High Use of Acid-Free Paper Now." Publishers Weekly, 26 May 1989, 17.

"Top Firms Pledge Use of Acid-Free Paper in Hardcover First Printings." Publishers Weekly, 31 March 1989, 12.

Tweedale, Dellene. "Procurement and Evaluation of Material for a University Archives." College and Research Libraries 26 (November 1965): 517-524; 531. In College and University Archives: Selected Readings, 134-144. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1979.

Walker, Gay, Jane Greenfield, John Fox, and Jeffrey S. Simonoff. "The Yale Library Survey: A Large Scale Study of Book Deterioration in the Yale University library." College and Research Libraries 46 (March 1985): 111-132.

Walton, Robert P. "Causes and Prevention of Deterioration in Book Materials." Bulletin of the New York Public Library 33 (April 1929): 235-51.